

PATENT

Docket No. 357358.00003

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

INVENTORS: Simon Jeremy East et al.

Confirmation No. 5211

APPLICATION NO. 10/572,174

FILED: March 16, 2006

Examiner: H. Fan

CASE NO. 357358.00003

Group Art Unit: 2456

**TITLE: METHOD OF PROVIDING CONTENT TO A MOBILE WEB
BROWSING DEVICE**

FILED ELECTRONICALLY ON January 19, 2011

Commissioner for Patents
MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF-PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attention: Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

REPLY BRIEF

This Reply Brief is filed in response to the Examiner's Answer, mailed November 19, 2010. Applicant believes that no fee is associated with the filing of this brief, but authorizes the Commissioner to charge any fees to Deposit Account No. 50-4364.

1. REPLY TO EXAMINER'S ARGUMENTS

On page 11 of the Examiner's Answer, the Office asserts that Applicant "conceded" that the claimed invention does not require the content itself to be sent from the device, and based on this assertion, the Office indicates that this argument is rendered moot (see Examiner's Answer, page 11, lines 4-16). So in the Examiner's Answer, the primary argument put forth by the Applicant is virtually ignored. This might be appropriate *if* the Applicant had

made the concession alleged by the Office. In fact, Applicant argued in its Appeal Brief that the user of the Chow device does not send the object of interest to the Revision Manager, and then, *as a secondary argument*, Applicant stated that "[e]ven if it were to be conceded (which it isn't) that Chow discloses the receipt at the remote computer of the object of interest, this still does not teach or suggest the claimed invention..." and then Applicant gave reasons why even if this concession were made, the claimed invention is still novel and non-obvious over Chow. Clearly this is not a concession, and yet the Office has treated it as such and has not addressed Applicant's primary argument.

Applicant respectfully requests the Board to consider all arguments submitted by Applicant, including the argument that the Office asserts as being moot.

In addition to the above, Applicant also reiterates here that the claimed invention receives a *log*, not the content (object) itself. It is notoriously well known that a log in the sense of the present application is much less than the actual content (e.g., changes only). The Office, in the Examiner's Answer, is equating the receipt of the content (object) itself to the receipt of a log. For the reasons stated in Applicant's Appeal Brief, Applicant submits that a log in the context of the claimed invention is well known to be less than the actual content in its entirety.

2. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and the reasons set forth in Applicant's Appeal Brief, Applicant respectfully requests this Board to overrule the Examiner's rejections and allow claims 1-9 and 11-16.

Respectfully submitted:

January 19, 2011

Date

/Mark D. Simpson/

Mark D. Simpson, Reg. No. 32,942

SAUL EWING LLP
Centre Square West
1500 Market Street, 38th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19102-2189
Telephone: 215 972 7880
Facsimile: 215 972 4169
Email: MSimpson@saul.com